arXiv:1510.03998v1 [cs.DM] 14 Oct 2015

On the Classes of Interval Graphs of Limited Nesting and Count of Lengths

Pavel Klavík[1,⋆], Yota Otachi[2], and Jiří Šejnoha[3]

[1] Computer Science Institute, Charles University, in Prague, Czech Republic. E-mail: klavik@iuuk.mff.cuni.cz.
[2] School of Information Science, Japan Advanced Institute of Science and Technology. Japan. E-mail: otachi@jaist.ac.jp.
[3] Department of Applied Mathematics, Faculty of Mathematics and Physics, Charles University, in Prague, Czech Republic. E-mail: jirka.sejnoha@gmail.com.

Abstract. In 1969, Roberts introduced *proper* and *unit interval graphs* and proved that these classes are equal. Natural generalizations of the second class were considered in which the number of different lengths of intervals is limited by k. Not much is known about them and the long-standing open problem asks how hard is recognition even for $k = 2$. In this paper, we show that a generalization of recognition called *partial representation extension* is NP-hard even for $k = 2$, while a quadratic-time algorithm is known for unit interval graphs.
We propose generalizations of proper interval graphs called *k-nested interval graphs* in which there are no chains of $k+1$ intervals nested in each other. We give a linear-time algorithm for recognition and a polynomial-time algorithm for partial representation extension. These results extend a list of examples, where problems involving geometry (k lengths) are much harder than similar problems involving topology (nesting k).

1 Introduction

Interval graphs. An *interval representation* $\mathcal{R}$ of a graph G is a collection $\{\langle u\rangle : u \in V(G)\}$ of closed intervals of the real line such that $uv \in E(G)$ if and only if $\langle u\rangle \cap \langle v\rangle \neq \emptyset$. A graph is an *interval graph* if it has an interval representation, and we denote this class by INT.

An interval representation is called *proper* if $\langle u\rangle \subseteq \langle v\rangle$ implies $\langle u\rangle = \langle v\rangle$, and *unit* if the length of all intervals $\langle u\rangle$ is one. The classes of *proper* and *unit interval graphs* (denoted PROPER INT and UNIT INT) consist of all interval graphs which have proper and unit interval representations, respectively. Roberts [24] proved that PROPER INT = UNIT INT.

The Studied Classes. In this paper, we consider two hierarchies of subclasses of interval graphs which generalize proper and unit interval graphs. The class k-NestedINT consists of all interval graphs which have representations with no $k+1$ intervals $\langle u_0\rangle, \ldots, \langle u_k\rangle$ such that $\langle u_0\rangle \subsetneq \langle u_1\rangle \subsetneq \cdots \subsetneq \langle u_k\rangle$; see Fig. 1a. The class k-LengthINT consists of all interval graphs which have representations

⋆ Supported by CE-ITI (GAČR P202/12/G061) and Charles University as GAUK 196213.



Fig. 1. (a) An interval representation with the nesting three. (b) The disjoint union of two components with the minimum nesting two, which require three different lengths of intervals. On the left, the shorter interval has to be shorter than $\frac{1}{4}$ of the longer one. On the right, it has to be longer than $\frac{1}{3}$ of it.

having at most k different lengths of intervals; see Fig. 1b. We know by [24] that 1-NestedINT = PROPER INT = UNIT INT = 1-LengthINT.

For an interval graph G, we denote the minimum nesting over all interval representations by $\nu(G)$, and the minimum number of interval lengths by $\lambda(G)$. Since nested intervals have different lengths, we know that $\nu(G) \leq \lambda(G)$ and this inequality may be strict (as in Fig. 1b). In other words, for each $k \geq 2$,

$$(k-1)\text{-LengthINT} \subsetneq k\text{-LengthINT} \subsetneq k\text{-NestedINT} \subsetneq (k+1)\text{-NestedINT}.$$

Fishburn [10, Theorem 5, p. 177] shows that graphs G in 2-NestedINT have unbounded $\lambda(G)$, so 2-NestedINT $\not\subseteq k$-LengthINT for each k. See Figure 2a.

Partial Representation Extension. This problem was introduced by Klavík et al. [18]. A *partial representation* $\mathcal{R}'$ of G is an interval representation $\{\langle x\rangle' : x \in V(G')\}$ of an induced subgraph G' of G. The vertices of G' and the intervals of $\mathcal{R}'$ are called *pre-drawn*. A representation $\mathcal{R}$ of G *extends* $\mathcal{R}'$ if and only if it assigns the same intervals to the vertices of G': $\langle x\rangle = \langle x\rangle'$ for every $x \in V(G')$.

Problem:	Partial Representation Extension – RepExt($\mathcal{C}$)
Input:	A graph G and a partial representation $\mathcal{R}'$ of G'.
Output:	Is there an interval representation of $\mathcal{C}$ of G extending $\mathcal{R}'$?

An $\mathcal{O}(n^2)$-time algorithm for interval graphs was given in [18]. There are two different linear-time algorithms [3,17] for this problem. Minimal obstructions making partial representations non-extendible are described in [19]. A linear-time algorithm for proper interval graphs and an almost quadratic-time algorithm for unit interval graphs are given in [15], and improved to quadratic time in [27].

The partial representation extension problems were also considered for other graph classes. Polynomial-time algorithms are known for circle graphs [7], and



(a) (b)

Fig. 2. (a) The Hasse diagram of proper inclusions of the considered classes. (b) We construct the code by labeling each interval with the length of the maximal chain of nested intervals ending in it. We code the graph by the left-to-right sequence of left endpoints ℓ and right endpoints r together with the nesting of the intervals.

permutation and function graphs [14]. The problems are NP-hard for chordal graphs [16] and contact representations of planar graphs [6]. Notable graph classes with the open complexity are circular-arc and trapezoid graphs.

Previous Results and Motivation. The classes k-LengthINT were introduced by Graham as a natural hierarchy between unit interval graphs and interval graphs; see Fig. 2a. Unfortunately, even after decades, the only results known are curiosities that illustrate the incredibly complex structure of k-LengthINT, very different from the case of unit interval graphs. For instance, k-LengthINT is not closed under disjoint unions; see Fig. 1b.

Leibowitz et al. [21] show that the class 2-LengthINT contains caterpillars, threshold, and unit interval graphs with one additional vertex. Further, there exist graphs G with $\lambda(G) > 2$ such that $\lambda(G \setminus x) \leq \lambda(G) - 2$ for $x \in V(G)$ [21]. Fishburn [9] shows that there are infinitely many forbidden induced subgraphs for 2-LengthINT (where UNIT INT are interval graphs just without $K_{1,3}$). It is also known [8] that there are graphs in 2-LengthINT such that, when the shorter length is fixed to 1, the longer one can be one of the real numbers belonging to arbitrary many distinct intervals of the real line, arbitrary far from each other.

Not much is known about the computational complexity of problems involving k-LengthINT, even recognition is open for $k = 2$. In [5], a polynomial-time algorithm is given for computing $\lambda(G)$ for interval graphs G which are extended bull-free or almost threshold (which highly restricts them). Skrien [26] characterized 2-LengthINT which can be realized by lengths zero (points) and one (unit intervals), leading to a linear-time recognition algorithm. As most of the efficient algorithms for intersection graph classes require representations, very little is known how to algorithmically use that a given interval graph can be represented by k lengths. One possibility is to assume that a representation is given by the input which is used in [12] to show that FO logic properties can be checked in FPT time (where the complexity depends on particular lengths), while it is W[2]-hard for general interval graphs. In this paper, we show that partial representation extension is NP-hard already for 2-LengthINT.

All these difficulties lead us to introduce another hierarchy of k-NestedINT which generalizes proper interval graphs; see Fig. 2. We illustrate the nice structure of k-NestedINT by describing a relatively simply linear-time recognition algorithm which we also generalize to a more involved polynomial-time algorithm for partial representation extension. To the best of our knowledge, the only reference is Fishburn's book [10] in which the parameter $\nu(G)$ called *depth* is considered and linked to k-LengthINT. There are some different generalizations of proper interval graphs [23], which are less rich and not linked to k-LengthINT.

Since k-NestedINT seem to share many properties with proper interval graphs, several future directions of research are immediately offered. It should be possible to describe minimal forbidden induced subgraphs. For the computational problems which are tractable for proper interval graphs and hard for interval graphs, the complexity of the intermediate problems for k-NestedINT can be studied. For instance, can the result of [12] be generalized to k-NestedINT?

We give an example of a shared property. An interval graph can be efficiently encoded by $2n\lceil \log n \rceil$ bits by labeling the vertices $1, \ldots, n$ and listing the left-to-right ordering of labels of the endpoints. Each proper interval graph offers an even more efficient encoding using $2n$ bits: the sequence of endpoints (ℓ for left one, r for right one), as they appear from left to right. Each left endpoint adds a new vertex to the queue and a right endpoint belongs to the first vertex in the queue which is then removed from the queue. We can generalize this to encode k-NestedINT using $2n\lceil \log k + 1 \rceil$ bits; see Fig. 2b.

Our Results. In [13], a polynomial-time algorithm is given for recognizing 2-LengthINT when intervals are partitioned into two subsets A and B, each of one length, and both $G[A]$ and $G[B]$ are connected. This approach might be generalized for partial representation extension, but we show that removing the connectedness condition makes it hard:

Theorem 1.1. *The problem* RepExt(2-LengthINT) *is* NP*-hard when (i) the input prescribes two lengths $a = 1$ and b, (ii) for every interval, the input assigns one of the lengths a or b, and (iii) every pre-drawn interval is of the length a. Also, it is* W[1]*-hard when parameterized by the number of pre-drawn intervals.*

In comparison, we give a dynamic programming algorithm for recognizing k-NestedINT, based on a data structure called an MPQ-tree. We show that we can optimize nesting greedily from the bottom to the top. We compute three different representations for each subtree and we show how to combine them.

Theorem 1.2. *The minimum nesting number $\nu(G)$ can be computed in time $\mathcal{O}(n + m)$ where n is the number of vertices and m is the number of edges. Therefore, the problem* Recog(k-NestedINT) *can be solved in linear time.*

The problem RepExt(k-NestedINT) is more involved since a straightforward greedy optimization from the bottom to the top does not work. We describe a dynamic programming algorithm which stores exponentially many possibilities efficiently and computes with them.

Theorem 1.3. *Partial representations can be extended in polynomial time while minimizing the nesting number. Therefore, the problem* RepExt(k-NestedINT) *is polynomial-time solvable.*

The last result contrasts with Theorem 1.1. Partial representation extension of k-NestedINT and k-LengthINT are problems for which the geometrical version (at most k lengths) is much harder than the corresponding topological problem (the left-to-right ordering of endpoints of intervals). A generalization of partial representation extension called bounded representations is NP-complete for unit interval graphs [15], but polynomial-time solvable for proper interval graphs [2]. Partially embedded planar graphs can be extended in linear time [1], but extension of geometric straight-line embeddings is NP-hard [22].

Preliminaries. The nesting defines a partial ordering $\subsetneq$ of intervals and we denote by $\nu(u)$ the length of the longest chain of nested intervals ending with $\langle u \rangle$. By $\mathrm{Pred}(u)$, we denote the set of all direct predecessors of $\langle u \rangle$ in $\subsetneq$.



Fig. 3. Two equivalent MPQ-trees with denoted sections, representing the graph from Fig. 8. In all figures, we denote P-nodes by circles and Q-nodes by rectangles.

2 Maximal Cliques and MPQ-trees

Lemma 2.1 (Fulkerson and Gross [11]). *A graph is an interval graph if and only if there exists a linear ordering $<$ of its maximal cliques such that, for each vertex, the maximal cliques containing this vertex appear consecutively.*

An ordering of the maximal cliques satisfying the statement of Lemma 2.1 is called a *consecutive ordering*. Each interval graph has $\mathcal{O}(n)$ maximal cliques of total size $\mathcal{O}(n+m)$ which can be found in linear time [25].

PQ-trees. A *PQ-tree* T is a rooted tree, introduced by Booth and Lueker [4]. Its leaves are in one-to-one correspondence with the maximal cliques. Its inner nodes are of two types: *P-nodes* and *Q-nodes*. Each P-node has at least two children, and each Q-node has at least three. The orderings of the children of inner nodes are given. The PQ-tree T represents one consecutive ordering $<_T$ called the *frontier* of T which is the ordering of the leaves from left to right.

The PQ-tree T represents all consecutive orderings of G as frontiers of equivalent PQ-trees which can be constructed from T by sequences of *equivalent transformations* of two types: (i) an arbitrary reordering of the children of a P-node, and (ii) a reversal of the order of the children of a Q-node; see Fig. 3. A subtree of T consists of a node and all its descendants. For a node N, its subtrees are the subtrees which have the children of N as the roots.

MPQ-trees. The *MPQ-tree* [20] is an augmentation of the PQ-tree in which the nodes of T have assigned subsets of $V(G)$ called *sections*. To a leaf representing a clique C, we assign one section $s(C)$. Similarly, to each P-node P, we assign one section $s(P)$. For a Q-node Q with subtrees $T_1, \ldots, T_n$, we have n sections $s_1(Q), \ldots, s_n(Q)$ ordered from left to right, each corresponding to one subtree.

The section $s(C)$ has all vertices contained in the maximal clique C and no other maximal clique. The section $s(P)$ of a P-node P has all vertices that are contained in all maximal cliques of the subtree rooted at P and in no other maximal clique. Let Q be a Q-node with subtrees $T_1, \ldots, T_n$. Let x be a vertex contained only in maximal cliques of the subtree rooted at Q, contained in maximal cliques of at least two subtrees. Then x is contained in every section $s_i(Q)$ such that some maximal clique of T_i contains x. See Fig. 3.

Every vertex x is in sections of exactly one node of T. In the case of a Q-node, it is placed in consecutive sections of this node. For a Q-node Q, if x is placed in a section $s_i(Q)$, then x is contained in all cliques of T_i. Every section of a Q-node is non-empty, and two consecutive sections have a non-empty intersection.

3 Extending Partial Representations with Two Lengths

The complexity of recognizing k-LengthINT is a long-standing open problem, even for $k = 2$. In this section, we show that the more general partial representation extension problem is NP-complete even when $k = 2$.

Proof (Theorem 1.1). We just adapt the reduction from 3-Partition used in [16,15]. Let $A_1, \ldots, A_{3s}$ and M be input of 3-Partition, with $\frac{M}{2} < A_i < \frac{M}{4}$ and $\sum A_i = Ms$. The task is to split A_i's into s triples, each summing to exactly M. We solve this problem by constructing an interval graph G and a partial representation $\mathcal{R}'$ as depicted in Fig. 4. For details, see Appendix A. □

4 Recognizing k-nested Interval Graphs

Our linear-time algorithm is a dynamic programming on the MPQ-tree. We process from the bottom to the top, and we optimize the minimal nesting.

Two vertices x and y are twins if and only if $N[x] = N[y]$. The standard observation is that twins can be ignored since they can be represented by identical intervals, and notice that this does not increase nesting and the number of lengths. We can locate all twins in time $\mathcal{O}(n + m)$ [25] and we can prune the graph by keeping one vertex per equivalence class of twins. So no two vertices belong to the exactly same sections of the MPQ-tree.

Triples. The general idea is that we compute triples (a, b, c) for each subtree of the MPQ-tree: a is the optimal nesting of the entire subtree, b is the nesting when the subtree is placed on a side of its parent, and c is used for Q-nodes. We define for a subtree T a triple (a, b, c) as follows. Let $G[T]$ be the interval graph induced by the vertices of the sections of T. Let G_a, G_b and G_c be graphs as in Fig. 5. We define $a = \nu(G_a) - 1 = \nu(G[T])$, $b = \nu(G_b) - 1$, and $c = \nu(G_c) - 1$.

The triple can be interpreted as increase in the nesting, depending how $G[T]$ is represented with respect to the rest of the graph. We compute these triples from the leaves to the root, and output a of the root as $\nu(G)$.

Lemma 4.1. *For any subtree T, its triple (a, b, c) satisfies $a - 1 \leq b \leq c \leq a$.*

Proof. We prove equivalently that $\nu(G_a) - 1 \leq \nu(G_b) \leq \nu(G_c) \leq \nu(G_a)$. We trivially know that $\nu(G_b) \leq \nu(G_c)$ since G_b is an induced subgraph of G_c.

Our definition of G_a implies that $\nu(G_a) = \nu(G[T]) + 1$, since in every interval representation of G_a, both endpoints of $\langle u \rangle$ are covered by attached paths, and



Fig. 4. We consider the following input for 3-Partition: $s = 2$, $M = 7$, $A_1 = A_2 = A_3 = A_4 = 2$ and $A_5 = A_6 = 3$. The associated graph G and an extending representation, giving the 3-partitioning $\{A_1, A_3, A_6\}$ and $\{A_2, A_4, A_5\}$.



Fig. 5. The graphs G_a, G_b and G_c, defining the triple (a, b, c) of T. The vertices of $G[T]$ are adjacent to the added vertices u and v are adjacent and not to the others.



Fig. 6. An MPQ-tree representing G with the computed triples (a, b, c) (equal on each level) and a representation minimizing nesting. We have that $\nu(G) = 3$.

there the representation of $G[T]$ is nested in $\langle u \rangle$. Since $\nu(G_b) \geq \nu(G[T])$, the inequality $\nu(G_a) - 1 \leq \nu(G_b)$ follows. Alternatively, one can take the nesting optimal G_b representation, stretch $\langle u \rangle$ (which increases nesting by at most one) and add the second attached path, to get a representation of G_a.

It remains to show the last inequality that $\nu(G_c) \leq \nu(G_a)$. Consider the representation of G_a with optimal nesting, in which $G[T]$ is strictly contained inside $\langle u \rangle$. By shifting u slightly to the right and adding v, we get a representation of G_c with the same nesting. □

Leaves. We initiate the triple (a, b, c) for every leaf L of the MPQ-tree as follows. If $s(L) = \emptyset$, we put $(0, 0, 0)$; otherwise we put $(1, 0, 0)$.

P-nodes. Let P be a P-node. Let $T_1, \ldots, T_n$ be the children of a P-node, with the computed triple (a_i, b_i, c_i) for each subtree T_i. We want to compute (a, b, c) for P. We first assume that $s(P) \neq \emptyset$. Let $w \in s(P)$, then the vertices of every subtree except two outer subtrees T_s and T_t are nested inside $\langle w \rangle$, so their minimal nesting number is increased by one. We can choose optimally two outer subtrees T_s and T_t, and their outer maximal cliques. Only the intervals contained in these two outer maximal cliques are not nested inside $\langle w \rangle$.

We get the following formulas (see Fig. 6):

$$a = \begin{cases} \max\{a_1, \ldots, a_n\}, & s(P) = \emptyset, \\ \min_{s \neq t} \max\{b_s, b_t, a_i : i \neq s, t\} + 1, & s(P) \neq \emptyset. \end{cases}$$
$$b = \min_s \max\{b_s, a_i : i \neq s\},$$
$$c = \max\{a_1, \ldots, a_n\}.$$

Lemma 4.2. *The formulas compute the triple (a, b, c) of a P-node P correctly.*

Proof. We know that $a = \nu(G[T])$. If $s(P) = \emptyset$, then $G[T]$ is the disjoint union of $G[T_1], \ldots, G[T_n]$ with $a_i = \nu(G[T_i])$, so $a = \max\{a_1, \ldots, a_n\}$. Otherwise, let

$w \in s(P)$. Then vertices of every subtree except for two outer T_s and T_t, which we are free to choose, are completely nested inside; therefore we minimize over all possible choices of $T_s \neq T_t$. For every $i \neq s, t$, we have the optimal nesting a_i increased by one because of $\langle w \rangle$. Now, T_s can be placed on one side of $\langle w \rangle$, while the other side is blocked by the remaining vertices. Therefore, we can simulate this by G_b of $G[T_s]$, where u corresponds to w. Therefore, the optimal nesting of $G[T]$ is at least $b_s + 1$, and similarly for T_t and $b_t + 1$.

Concerning b, we have in every representation $\langle u \rangle$ with one side covered by the attached path. Therefore all vertices of $G[T]$ are either nested in $\langle u \rangle$, or intersect the other side. We can always place all vertices of $s(P)$ in such a way that they are not nested in $\langle u \rangle$, and so we can ignore them. All vertices of $G[T]$ except for one subtree T_s, which we can arbitrarily choose, have to be nested in $\langle u \rangle$. Therefore, their optimal nesting a_i is increased by one by $\langle u \rangle$. For T_s, the nesting again corresponds to the optimal nesting of G_b of $G[T_s]$, which is $b_s + 1$. Therefore we get $\nu(G_b) = \min_s \max\big(\{a_i + 1 : i \neq s\} \cup \{b_s + 1\}\big)$, which gives the formula for b since $b = \nu(G_b) - 1$.

Concerning c, we have also $\langle v \rangle$. We can choose T_s and T_t so that T_s has optimized nesting with respect to $\langle u \rangle$ and T_t with respect to $\langle v \rangle$. But anyway all intervals of $G[T_s]$ are nested in $\langle v \rangle$ and all intervals of $G[T_t]$ are nested in $\langle u \rangle$. Therefore this optimization is useless and we just get $\nu(G_c) = \max\{a_1 + 1, \ldots, a_n + 1\}$. □

Q-nodes. To optimize Q-nodes, the values c are also required. Let Q be a Q-node with children $T_1, \ldots, T_n$, where $n \geq 3$, each with a triple (a_i, b_i, c_i). We first work with each section $s_i(Q)$ separately. We say for $u, v \in s(Q)$ that u is *nested* in v if v is contained in a section more to the left than all sections of u and in a section more to the right than all sections of u.

Let A_i be the length of the longest chain of nested intervals of $s(Q)$ which all are contained in both $s_{i-1}(Q)$ and $s_{i+1}(Q)$. Similarly, let B_i be the length of the longest chain where the first interval is contained in $s_i(Q)$, but not in $s_{i+1}(Q)$, and C_i for the first interval contained in $s_i(Q)$ but not $s_{i-1}(Q)$. Without loss of generality, we assume $C_i \leq B_i$, otherwise we flip T_i in the argument. The two outer sections have $C_i = A_i = 0$ and $B_i = 1$. The inner sections can have any of the three parameters equal zero.

We define $d_i = \max\{A_i + a_i, B_i + b_i, C_i + c_i\}$. In the case of b, all sections of the Q-node except for the first or the last one are completely covered by u. Therefore,

$$a = c = \max\{d_i\}, \quad b = \max\big(\{d_i : i > 1\} \cup \{b_1\}\big).$$

Lemma 4.3. *The formulas compute the triple (a, b, c) of a Q-node Q correctly.*

Proof. We first explain the formula for a which is equal to $\nu(G[T])$. To minimize the nesting of $G[T]$, we need to minimize the nesting of $G[Q]$ and minimize each of the nestings of $G[T_i]$. It is important that each of these can be optimized completely independently of the others. Concerning minimality of the nesting of $G[Q]$, we can easily construct a representation in which two intervals are nested if and only if they are nested in sections of Q.

Suppose that we want to optimize the nesting of $G[T_i]$. We want to show that for some representation of $G[T]$, the maximum nesting of the intervals $G[T_i] \cup s_i(Q)$ is equal d_i. Since these can be optimized independently, we get $\nu(G[T]) = \max\{d_i\}$.

All intervals of $G[T_i]$ are nested inside all intervals of the chain defining A_i. Therefore, this nesting is at least $A_i + a_i$. We can choose two maximal cliques in T_i, one to the left and the other to the right, and all other vertices not contained in these cliques are nested in every vertex of $s_i(Q)$. The parameters b_i and c_i describe the optimal nesting of $G[T_i]$ inside the starting intervals of the chains defining B_i and C_i, respectively. Therefore, at least the nesting d_i is required and a representation achieving it can be constructed.

Concerning the definition of b, we can only save on the nesting of $G[T_1]$ or $G[T_n]$. So we assume that we can save on $G[T_1]$ at least as much as on $G[T_n]$, otherwise we flip the Q-node and so swap them. Let $w \in s_1(Q)$. Now, the total nesting of G_b there is $b_1 + 1$, since at least b_1 intervals are nested inside both $\langle w \rangle$ and $\langle u \rangle$. For the remaining subtrees, we cannot save anything, so we have nesting $d_i + 1$. Therefore, $\nu(G_b) = \max\{d_i + 1 : i > 1\} \cup \{b_1 + 1\}$, which gives the formula for b. For c, the formula similarly follows. □

Putting Together. Now, we are ready to prove that RECOG(k-NestedINT) can be solved in linear time:

Proof (Theorem 1.2). If a graph is an interval graph, we can compute its MPQ-tree in time $\mathcal{O}(n + m)$. Then we process the tree from the bottom to the root and compute triples (a, b, c) for every node, as described above. We output a of the root which is the minimal nesting number $\nu(G)$. By Lemmas 4.2 and 4.3, this value is computed correctly. We argue in Appendix B that the running time of the algorithm is $\mathcal{O}(n + m)$. □

5 Extending Partial Representations of Minimal Nesting

In this section, we sketch a polynomial time algorithm; see Appendix D.

Partial Ordering $\lhd$. The paper [17] characterizes all extendible partial representations in terms of consecutive orderings. A certain partial ordering $\lhd$ of maximal cliques is derived from the partial representation $\mathcal{R}'$; see Appendix C.

Lemma 5.1 ([17]). *A partial representation $\mathcal{R}'$ is extendible if and only if there exists a consecutive ordering $<$ of the maximal cliques extending the interval order $\lhd$. The consecutive orderings of extending representations are exactly the consecutive ordering extending $\lhd$.*

General Idea. We want to minimize the nesting similarly as in Section 4. A partial representation $\mathcal{R}'$ poses three restrictions: (i) Some pre-drawn intervals can be nested in each other which increases the nesting. (ii) The consecutive ordering has to extend $\lhd$ which restricts the possible shuffling of subtrees. (iii) Some subtrees can be optimized differently depending on the side they are attached.

Concerning (iii), instead of a triple, we compute for every subtree T a tuple $(a, b^{\leftarrow}, c^{\rightarrow}, b^{\rightarrow}, c^{\leftarrow})$. These number are equal to minimum nestings of extending representations of partial representations of G_a, G_b and G_c, in which the pre-drawn vertices of $G[T]$ are pre-drawn the same and we have pre-drawn $\langle u\rangle'$ (and possibly $\langle v\rangle'$) with their added neighbors. The difference between $b^{\leftarrow}$ and $b^{\rightarrow}$ is whether $\langle u\rangle'$ covers the right side of $G[T]$, or covers the left side of $G[T]$; similarly for $c^{\leftarrow}$ and $c^{\rightarrow}$.

For (i), we compute for pre-drawn intervals $\langle x\rangle'$ their nesting $\nu(x)$ in an optimal extending representation of $\mathcal{R}'$ constructed by the algorithm, from bottom to the top as they are encountered in the MPQ-tree. We show that for each $\nu(x)$ and each $b^{\leftarrow}$, $c^{\rightarrow}$, $b^{\rightarrow}$ and $c^{\leftarrow}$, their values are determined up to one and we can force some subtrees to optimize them. Unfortunately, some of these values cannot be optimized simultaneously, so we introduce the concept of an optimization graph H. The vertices are variables and we have an edge $xy \in E(H)$ if and only if they cannot be optimized at the same time. Therefore the optimizable subsets of variables are the independent sets in H.

P-nodes. We have a P-node P with subtrees $T_1, \ldots, T_n$ with the computed tuple $(a_i, b_i^{\leftarrow}, c_i^{\rightarrow}, b_i^{\rightarrow}, c_i^{\leftarrow})$ and the optimization graph H_i for each subtree T_i and $\nu(x)$. Because of (ii), we get that T_s has to be one of the minimal elements $\min(\lhd)$ of $\lhd$ and T_t one of the maximal elements $\max(\lhd)$. Suppose that $T_s \in \min(\lhd)$ and $T_t \in \max(\lhd)$ is fixed.

We first compute $\nu(x)$ for intervals of $s(P)$, according to $\subsetneq$. Assuming that we know $\nu(y)$ for every $y \in \mathrm{Pred}(x)$, we compute $\nu(x)$ as follows:

$$\nu(x) = \max\left\{b_s^{\leftarrow}, b_t^{\rightarrow}, a_i, \nu(y) : i \neq s, t \text{ and } y \in \mathrm{Pred}(x)\right\} + 1.$$

Then, we compute $(a, b^{\leftarrow}, b^{\rightarrow}, c^{\rightarrow}, c^{\leftarrow})$:

$$\begin{aligned}
a &= \max\{a_1, \ldots, a_k, \nu(y) : y \in \mathrm{Pred}(u)\}.\\
b^{\leftarrow} &= \max\{b_s^{\leftarrow}, a_i, \nu(y) : i \neq s \text{ and } y \in \mathrm{Pred}(u)\}.\\
c^{\rightarrow} &= \max\{b_t^{\rightarrow}, a_i, \nu(y) : i \neq t \text{ and } y \in \mathrm{Pred}(v)\}.\\
b^{\rightarrow} &= \max\{b_t^{\rightarrow}, a_i, \nu(y) : i \neq t \text{ and } y \in \mathrm{Pred}(u)\}.\\
c^{\leftarrow} &= \max\{b_s^{\leftarrow}, a_i, \nu(y) : i \neq s \text{ and } y \in \mathrm{Pred}(v)\}.
\end{aligned}$$

The value of a can be always obtained greedily. Since the values given by $T_1, \ldots, T_n$ are not fully determined, we create a new optimization subgraph H of T as the disjoint union of $H_1, \ldots, H_n$ together with new pre-drawn vertices of $s(P)$ and $b^{\leftarrow}$, $b^{\rightarrow}$, $c^{\leftarrow}$ and $c^{\rightarrow}$, and we add suitable edges.

Now, we run the above computation over all choices of $T_s \in \min(\lhd)$ and $T_t \in \max(\lhd)$. Since $b^{\leftarrow}$ and $c^{\rightarrow}$ might be optimized using different subtrees T_s and T_t than $b^{\rightarrow}$ and $c^{\leftarrow}$, we argue that the situation is not very limited, so we can combine optimizations together in one H.

Q-node. We have a Q-node Q with subtrees $T_1, \ldots, T_n$ with the computed tuple $(a_i, b_i^{\leftarrow}, c_i^{\rightarrow}, b_i^{\rightarrow}, c_i^{\leftarrow})$ and the optimization graph H_i for each subtree T_i and $\nu(x)$. Because of (ii), we get that the Q-node might be flippable (which greatly restricts

it), or not. For a subtree T_i, we may optimize it with respect to its left side, which is encoded by $b_i^{\leftarrow}$ and $c_i^{\rightarrow}$, or with respect to the right side, which is encoded by $c_i^{\leftarrow}$ and $b_i^{\rightarrow}$. In the former case, we put $\bigcirc_i^{\leftarrow} = b_i^{\leftarrow}$ and $\bigcirc_i^{\rightarrow} = c_i^{\rightarrow}$. In the latter case, we put $\bigcirc_i^{\leftarrow} = c_i^{\leftarrow}$ and $\bigcirc_i^{\rightarrow} = b_i^{\rightarrow}$. We have trade-offs leading to exponentially many possibilities how $\bigcirc_i^{\leftarrow}$ and $\bigcirc_i^{\rightarrow}$ can be chosen, which we capture by the optimization graph H.

Suppose that we fix some choices of $\bigcirc_i^{\leftarrow}$ and $\bigcirc_i^{\rightarrow}$. Unlike for P-nodes, we compute $\nu(x)$ for all intervals of sections of Q, not just for the pre-drawn ones. For two such vertices, we define $\subsetneq$ by nesting of sections, similarly as in Section 4. We process them from the bottom to the top according to $\subsetneq$. Suppose that we process some x and we know $\nu(y)$ for every direct predecessor of x, and let $s_s(Q)$ be the leftmost section of x and s_t be the rightmost section. We get the following formula:

$$\nu(x) = \max\{\bigcirc_s^{\leftarrow}, \bigcirc_t^{\rightarrow}, a_i, \nu(y) : s < i < t \text{ and } y \in \mathrm{Pred}(x)\} + 1.$$

Then, we compute $(a, b^{\leftarrow}, b^{\rightarrow}, c^{\rightarrow}, c^{\leftarrow})$ as follows:

$$\begin{aligned}
a &= \max\{a_1, \ldots, a_n, \nu(y) : y \in \mathrm{Pred}(u)\} \\
b^{\leftarrow} &= \max\{b_1^{\leftarrow}, a_i, \nu(y) : i > 1 \text{ and } y \in \mathrm{Pred}(u)\}. \\
c^{\rightarrow} &= \max\{b_n^{\rightarrow}, a_i, \nu(y) : i < n \text{ and } y \in \mathrm{Pred}(v)\}. \\
b^{\rightarrow} &= \max\{b_n^{\rightarrow}, a_i, \nu(y) : i < n \text{ and } y \in \mathrm{Pred}(u)\}. \\
c^{\leftarrow} &= \max\{b_1^{\leftarrow}, a_i, \nu(y) : i > 1 \text{ and } y \in \mathrm{Pred}(v)\}.
\end{aligned}$$

We show some involved structural properties that each variable is determined up to one. Therefore, we may encode all possibilities into the optimization graph H constructed, similarly as in the case of P-nodes.

Putting Together. For Theorem 1.3, we construct a polynomial time algorithm for RepExt(k-NestedINT) as follows. We process the MPQ-tree from the bottom to the top. We have to argue that each step can be computed in polynomial time (easy) and that it computes the tuples $(a, b^{\leftarrow}, b^{\rightarrow}, c^{\rightarrow}, c^{\leftarrow})$ and the optimization graph H correctly (involved).

Acknowledgment. We want to thank Takehiro Ito and Hirotaka Ono for fruitful discussions.

References

1. P. Angelini, G. D. Battista, F. Frati, V. Jelínek, J. Kratochvíl, M. Patrignani, and I. Rutter. Testing planarity of partially embedded graphs. In *SODA '10*, 2010.
2. M. Balko, P. Klavík, and Y. Otachi. Bounded representations of interval and proper interval graphs. In *ISAAC*, volume 8283 of *LNCS*, pages 535–546. Springer, 2013.
3. T. Bläsius and I. Rutter. Simultaneous PQ-ordering with applications to constrained embedding problems. In *SODA '13*, 2013.
4. K. S. Booth and G. S. Lueker. Testing for the consecutive ones property, interval graphs, and planarity using PQ-tree algorithms. *J. Comput. System Sci.*, 13:335–379, 1976.

5. M. R. Cerioli, F. de S. Oliveira, and J. L. Szwarcfiter. On counting interval lengths of interval graphs. *Discrete Applied Mathematics*, 159(7):532 – 543, 2011.
6. S. Chaplick, P. Dorbec, J. Kratochvíl, M. Montassier, and J. Stacho. Contact representations of planar graphs: Extending a partial representation is hard. In *WG'14*, volume 8747 of *LNCS*, pages 139–151. 2014.
7. S. Chaplick, R. Fulek, and P. Klavík. Extending partial representations of circle graphs. In *Graph Drawing*, volume 8242 of *LNCS*, pages 131–142. Springer, 2013.
8. P. C. Fishburn. Paradoxes of two-length interval orders. *Discrete Mathematics*, 52(2):165–175, 1984.
9. P. C. Fishburn. Interval graphs and interval orders. *Discrete Mathematics*, 55(2):135–149, 1985.
10. P. C. Fishburn. *Interval orders and interval graphs: A study of partially ordered sets*. John Wiley & Sons, 1985.
11. D. R. Fulkerson and O. A. Gross. Incidence matrices and interval graphs. *Pac. J. Math.*, 15:835–855, 1965.
12. R. Ganian, P. Hliněný, D. Král', J. Obdržálek, J. Schwartz, and J. Teska. Fo model checking of interval graphs. In *ICALP*, volume 7966 of *LNCS*, pages 250–262. 2013.
13. F. Joos, C. Löwenstein, F. de S. Oliveira, D. Rautenbach, and J. L. Szwarcfiter. Graphs of interval count two with a given partition. *Information Processing Letters*, 114(10):542–546, 2014.
14. P. Klavík, J. Kratochvíl, T. Krawczyk, and B. Walczak. Extending partial representations of function graphs and permutation graphs. In *ESA*, volume 7501 of *LNCS*, pages 671–682. Springer, 2012.
15. P. Klavík, J. Kratochvíl, Y. Otachi, I. Rutter, T. Saitoh, M. Saumell, and T. Vyskočil. Extending partial representations of proper and unit interval graphs. In *SWAT*, volume 8503 of *LNCS*, pages 253–264. Springer, 2014.
16. P. Klavík, J. Kratochvíl, Y. Otachi, and T. Saitoh. Extending partial representations of subclasses of chordal graphs. In *ISAAC*, volume 7676 of *LNCS*, pages 444–454. Springer, 2012.
17. P. Klavík, J. Kratochvíl, Y. Otachi, T. Saitoh, and T. Vyskočil. Extending partial representations of interval graphs. *CoRR*, abs/1306.2182, 2013.
18. P. Klavík, J. Kratochvíl, and T. Vyskočil. Extending partial representations of interval graphs. In *TAMC*, volume 6648 of *LNCS*, pages 276–285. Springer, 2011.
19. P. Klavík and M. Saumell. Minimal obstructions for partial representation extension of interval graphs. In *ISAAC*, volume 8889 of *LNCS*, pages 401–413, 2014.
20. N. Korte and R. Möhring. An incremental linear-time algorithm for recognizing interval graphs. *SIAM J. Comput.*, 18(1):68–81, 1989.
21. R. Leibowitz, S. F. Assmann, and G. W. Peck. The interval count of a graph. *SIAM J. Algebr. Discrete Methods*, 3:485–494, 1982.
22. M. Patrignani. On extending a partial straight-line drawing. In *LNCS*, volume 3843, pages 380–385, 2006.
23. A. Proskurowski and J. A. Telle. Classes of graphs with restricted interval models. *Discrete Mathematics & Theoretical Computer Science*, 3(4):167–176, 1999.
24. F. S. Roberts. Indifference graphs. *Proof techniques in graph theory*, pages 139–146, 1969.
25. D. J. Rose, R. E. Tarjan, and G. S. Lueker. Algorithmic aspects of vertex elimination on graphs. *SICOMP*, 5(2):266–283, 1976.
26. D. Skrien. Chronological orderings of interval graphs. *Discrete Appl. Math.*, 8(1):69–83, 1984.
27. F. J. Soulignac. Bounded, minimal, and short representations of unit interval and unit circular-arc graphs. *CoRR*, abs/1408.3443, 2014.

A Hardness of Extending Partial Representations with Two Lengths

We just adapt the reduction from 3-Partition used in [16,15]. Let $A_1, \ldots, A_{3s}$ and M be input of 3-Partition, with $\frac{M}{2} < A_i < \frac{M}{4}$ and $\sum A_i = Ms$. The task is to split A_i's into s triples, each summing to exactly M.

We solve this problem by constructing an interval graph G and a partial representation $\mathcal{R}'$ as depicted in Fig. 7. We claim that $\mathcal{R}'$ can be extended using two lengths of intervals if and only if the original instance of 3-Partition is solvable. We set $a = 1$ and $b = s \cdot (M+1)$. The partial representation $\mathcal{R}'$ consists of $s+1$ disjoint pre-drawn intervals $v_0, \ldots, v_s$ of length a, with their pre-drawn positions

$$\ell'(v_i) = i \cdot (M+2).$$

So they split the real line into s equal gaps of size $M+1$ and two infinite regions.

Aside $v_0, \ldots, v_s$, the graph G contains several other vertices. There is exactly one vertex w of the length b, adjacent to every vertex in G. Further, for each A_i, the graph $G \setminus w$ contains P_{2A_i} (a path with $2A_i$ vertices) as one component, with each vertex of the length a.

This reduction is clearly polynomial. It remains to show that $\mathcal{R}'$ is extendible if and only if the instance of 3-Partition is solvable. First, because of the length constraint, in every extending representation has $\ell(w) = 1$; otherwise it would not intersect either v_0, or v_s. Therefore, each of the paths P_{2A_i} has to be placed in exactly one of the s gaps. In every representation of P_{2A_i}, it requires the space at least $A_i + \varepsilon$ for some $\varepsilon > 0$. Therefore, three paths can be packed into the same gap if and only if their three integers sum to at most M. Therefore, an extending representation $\mathcal{R}'$ gives a solution to 3-Partition, and vice versa. We get W[1]-hardness by a similar reduction from BinPacking, as in [16].

We note that the above reduction can be easily modified for the case in which b would not be specified by the input. We add two extra vertices: w_0 adjacent to v_0 and w_s adjacent to v_s such that both are non-adjacent to w. It forces the length of w to be in the interval $[s \cdot (M+1), s \cdot (M+1) + 2)$. Similarly, this reduction would work even when each interval would not have a length assigned, aside the pre-drawn intervals in $\mathcal{R}'$ indeed.



Fig. 7. We consider the following input for 3-Partition: $s = 2$, $M = 7$, $A_1 = A_2 = A_3 = A_4 = 2$ and $A_5 = A_6 = 3$. The associated graph G is depicted on top, and at the bottom we find one of its extending representations, giving the 3-partitioning $\{A_1, A_3, A_6\}$ and $\{A_2, A_4, A_5\}$.

B Linear-time Complexity for Recog(k-NestedINT)

Lemma B.1. *For a P-node with n children, the triple (a, b, c) can be computed in time $\mathcal{O}(n)$.*

Proof. By Lemma 4.1, we always have either $b_i = a_i - 1$, or $b_i = a_i$. Only in the former case, we can optimize the nesting by choosing s or t equal i. We call these T_i *savable*. Concerning c, we just find the maximum a_i which can be done in time $\mathcal{O}(n)$. Concerning a and b, we first locate all T_i which maximize a_i. If at least one of them is not savable, say T_j, then $a = a_j + 1$ and $b = a_j$. Otherwise if all are savable, then the values depend on the number of T_i's maximizing a_i. If there are at most two, then $a = a_i$, otherwise $a = a_i + 1$. If there is at most one, then $b = b_i$, otherwise $b = b_i + 1$. □

Lemma B.2. *For a Q-node Q, the triple (a, b, c) can be computed in time $\mathcal{O}(n + m_Q)$, where m_Q is the number of edges of $G[Q]$.*

Proof. We first compute the numbers A_i, B_i and C_i for every section of the Q-node. We are given the sections of the Q-node, and for every interval u in the sections of the Q-node, we know its leftmost section and its rightmost section. We proceed in two steps. First, we compute the DAG of nesting for all vertices of the sections of Q. This can be done by considering all edges, and testing for each whether the pair is nested.

Then we add to this DAG an extra minimal vertex for each section. Then we compute in linear time with respect to the size of the DAG the lengths of longest paths going from each of the minimal elements up. These lengths are the numbers A_i, and we can compute B_i and C_i similarly. The total time consumed in this part is $\mathcal{O}(n + m_Q)$. Using these numbers, it is trivial to output (a, b, c) as defined above. □

C Definition of The Partial Ordering $\lhd$

Figure 8 shows two consecutive orderings. In this appendix, we explain a characterization of extendible partial representations due to Klavík et al. [17] which generalizes the theorem of Fulkerson and Gross [11]. The characterization derives from $\mathcal{R}'$ a partial ordering $\lhd$ such that the consecutive ordering of the maximal cliques of any extending representation $\mathcal{R}$ extends $\lhd$.

Restricting Clique-points. Suppose that there exists a representation $\mathcal{R}$ extending $\mathcal{R}'$. Then $\mathcal{R}$ gives some ordering $<$ of the maximal cliques from left to right. We want to show that pre-drawn intervals give constraints in form of a partial ordering $\lhd$. Figure 9 illustrates these constraints given by a pair of



Fig. 8. An interval graph G and two of its representations with different left-to-right orderings of the maximal cliques, with choices of clique-points.



Fig. 9. Possible relative positions of pre-drawn intervals $\langle x\rangle$ and $\langle y\rangle$, and some examples of the Hasse diagrams of the posed constraints. The consecutive ordering of the maximal cliques of every extending representation has to extend $\lhd$. (a) All maximal cliques containing x have to be on the left of those containing y. (b) All maximal cliques containing x have to be on the left of those containing both x and y, which are on the left of those containing only y. (c) A containment of pre-drawn intervals poses no constraints. A maximal clique containing only x can be either on the left or on the right of the maximal cliques containing both x and y.

pre-drawn intervals. By generalizing it to all pre-drawn intervals, we get the definition of $\lhd$.

For a maximal clique a, let $P(a)$ denote the set of all pre-drawn intervals that are contained in a. Recall that a clique-point $\mathrm{cp}(a)$ is some point chosen from the intersection of all intervals of a in the interval representation $\mathcal{R}$. Then $P(a)$ restricts the possible position of the clique-point $\mathrm{cp}(a)$ to only those points x of the real line which are covered in $\mathcal{R}'$ by exactly the pre-drawn intervals of $P(a)$ and no others. We denote the set of these admissible positions by $\downarrow_a$, formally:

$$\downarrow_a = \big\{x : x \in \mathbb{R} \text{ and } x \in \langle u\rangle' \iff u \in P(a)\big\};$$

for examples see Fig. 10a. Equivalently, $\downarrow_a$ is defined in [2] as

$$\downarrow_a = \Big(\bigcap_{u\in P(a)} \langle u\rangle'\Big) \setminus \Big(\bigcup_{v\notin P(a)} \langle v\rangle'\Big). \tag{1}$$

We are interested in the extremal points of $\downarrow_a$. By $\curvearrowleft(a)$ (resp. $\curvearrowright(a)$), we denote the infimum (resp. the supremum) of $\downarrow_a$. We use an open interval $I_a = (\curvearrowleft(a), \curvearrowright(a))$ to represent $\downarrow_a$. We note that this does not imply that $\downarrow_a$ contains all points between $\curvearrowleft(a)$ and $\curvearrowright(a)$; see $\downarrow_b$ in Fig. 10.

The Interval Order $\lhd$. For two distinct maximal cliques a and b, we write $a \lhd b$ if $\curvearrowright(a) \le \curvearrowleft(b)$, or in other words, if I_a is on the left of I_b. We put $a \lhd a$ if $\curvearrowright(a) < \curvearrowleft(a)$, which happens exactly when $\downarrow_a = \emptyset$. The definition of $\lhd$ is quite natural since $a \lhd b$ implies that every extending representation $\mathcal{R}$ has to place $\mathrm{cp}(a)$ to the left of $\mathrm{cp}(b)$. For instance, in Fig. 10, we get that $a \lhd b \lhd d$ and $a \lhd c \lhd d$, but b and c are incomparable.

We note that the ordering $\lhd$ is a so called *interval order* represented by open intervals I_a. The reason is that $a \lhd b$ if and only if I_a and I_b are disjoint and I_a



Fig. 10. (a) Four maximal cliques a, b, c, and d with $P(a) = \{u, v\}$, $P(b) = \{y\}$, $P(c) = \{x, y\}$, and $P(d) = \{y, z\}$. The possible positions $\downarrow_a$, $\downarrow_b$, $\downarrow_c$, and $\downarrow_d$ of their clique-points are denoted. (b) The corresponding open intervals I_a, I_b, I_c, and I_d.

is on the left of I_b. Interval orders are studied in the context of time constraints and have many applications; for instance, see [10].

Lemma C.1 (Klavík et al. [17]). *A partial representation $\mathcal{R}'$ is extendible if and only if there exists a consecutive ordering of the maximal cliques which extends $\lhd$.*

It is obvious that the constraints posed by $\lhd$ are necessary. The other implication is proved in [17] as follows. Suppose that $<$ is a consecutive ordering extending $\lhd$. We place the clique-points greedily from left to right according $<$. We place each clique-point on the right of the previously placed ones, as far to the left as possible (so saving as much space as possible). It is shown that if this greedy procedure fails, then either $<$ does not extend $\lhd$, or it is not a consecutive ordering.

D Extending Partial Representations of Minimal Nesting

In this section, we generalize the previous algorithm of Section 4. We show that the problem RepExt(k-NestedINT) can be solved in polynomial time.

Concerning twin vertices, in the case of partial representations, this is no longer true that we can remove them since pre-drawn twins can be represented by different intervals. But we can prune the graph in the following way: each equivalence class of twins either consists of a single non-predrawn vertex, or all its vertices are pre-drawn.

Partial Ordering $\lhd$. The paper [17] solves the problem RepExt(INT) in linear time and characterizes all extendible partial representations in terms of orderings of maximal cliques. A certain partial ordering $\lhd$ of maximal cliques is derived from the partial representation $\mathcal{R}'$; see Appendix C.

Lemma D.1 ([17]). *A partial representation $\mathcal{R}'$ is extendible if and only if there exists a consecutive ordering $<$ of the maximal cliques extending the interval order $\lhd$.*

If $\mathcal{R}$ extends a partial representation $\mathcal{R}'$, then the consecutive ordering in $\mathcal{R}$ has to extend $\lhd$. On the other hand, to every consecutive ordering extending $\lhd$, we can construct a representation $\mathcal{R}$ extending $\mathcal{R}'$.

One can find such an ordering $<$ as follows. We process the MPQ-tree from the bottom to the root, always reorder the local subtree according to $\lhd$. If it is not possible to reorder it, then no extending ordering $<$ exists. Otherwise, if an ordering $<$ exists, we can show that any local solution is correct and can be extended to some solution $<'$. For two subtrees T_i and T_j, we denote $T_i \lhd T_j$ if there exist cliques $a \in T_i$ and $b \in T_j$ such that $a \lhd b$. For a P-node, we choose any topological sort of its subtrees according to $\lhd$. For a Q-node, we test whether one of the two orderings is compatible with $\lhd$.

General Idea. We want to minimize the nesting similarly as in Section 4. A partial representation $\mathcal{R}'$ poses three restrictions: (i) Some pre-drawn intervals can

be nested in each other which increases the nesting. (ii) The consecutive ordering has to extend $\lhd$ which restricts the possible shuffling of subtrees. (iii) Some subtrees can be optimized differently depending on the side they are attached.

Notation. Let N be a node of the MPQ-tree. We define $\langle\uparrow N\rangle$ as he intersection of all pre-drawn intervals in the sections above N (on the path from N to the root). Similarly for a subtree T with the root node N, we put $\langle\uparrow T\rangle = \langle\uparrow N\rangle$. We call a subtree T *interior* if all pre-drawn intervals of T are strictly contained in $\langle\uparrow T\rangle$, and *exterior* otherwise. We call its pre-drawn intervals *interior* and *exterior with respect to* T, respectively.

If some vertex x belongs to sections of a Q-node Q, we denote by $s_x^{\leftarrow}(Q)$ the leftmost section containing x and by $s_x^{\rightarrow}(Q)$ the rightmost one. If x belongs to sections of a subtree T_i of Q, we put $s_x^{\leftarrow}(Q) = s_x^{\rightarrow}(Q) = s_i(Q)$.

Tuples. For every subtree T of the MPQ-tree, instead of a triple, we compute a tuple $(a, b^{\leftarrow}, c^{\rightarrow}, b^{\rightarrow}, c^{\leftarrow})$. We construct graphs G_a, G_b and G_c exactly as before, together with some partial representations.

The partial representation $\mathcal{R}'_a$ consists of pre-drawn intervals of $G[T]$.

We consider two partial representations $\mathcal{R}'_{b\leftarrow}$ and $\mathcal{R}'_{b\rightarrow}$ for G_b. The partial representation $\mathcal{R}'_{b\leftarrow}$ further contains pre-drawn intervals $\langle u\rangle'$ and its added neighbors, such that $\ell(u) = \ell(\uparrow N)$ and its neighbor covers $r(u)$ far to the left of pre-drawn intervals of $G[T]$. The partial representation $\mathcal{R}'_{b\rightarrow}$ is defined symmetrically on the right.

For G_c, we also consider two partial representations $\mathcal{R}'_{c\rightarrow}$ and $\mathcal{R}'_{c\leftarrow}$. The partial representation $\mathcal{R}'_{c\rightarrow}$ is created from $\mathcal{R}'_{b\leftarrow}$ by adding the pre-drawn intervals $\langle v\rangle'$ and its added neighbors, such that $r(v) = r(\uparrow N)$ and its neighbor covers $\ell(v)$ far to the right of pre-drawn intervals of $\mathcal{R}'_{b\leftarrow}$. The partial representation $\mathcal{R}'_{c\leftarrow}$ is defined symmetrically from $\mathcal{R}'_{b\rightarrow}$.

We get $a = \nu(u) - 1$ where $\nu(u)$ is the minimum over all extending representations of $\mathcal{R}'_a$, and similarly for $b^{\leftarrow}$ and $\mathcal{R}'_{b\leftarrow}$, and $b^{\rightarrow}$ and $\mathcal{R}'_{b\rightarrow}$. We define $c^{\rightarrow} = \nu(v) - 1$ where $\nu(v)$ is the minimum over all extending representations of $\mathcal{R}'_{c\rightarrow}$ such that $\nu(u) = b^{\leftarrow} + 1$. We define $c^{\leftarrow}$ symmetrically for $\mathcal{R}'_{c\leftarrow}$ and $b^{\rightarrow}$.

Lemma D.2. *Let T be an interior subtree of the MPQ-tree. Then the tuple $(a, b^{\leftarrow}, c^{\rightarrow}, b^{\rightarrow}, c^{\leftarrow})$ satisfies:*

$$a - 1 \le b^{\leftarrow} = b^{\rightarrow} \le c^{\leftarrow} = c^{\rightarrow} \le a.$$

Proof. We always know that $b^{\leftarrow} \le c^{\rightarrow}$ and $b^{\rightarrow} \le c^{\leftarrow}$.

For $a - 1 \le b^{\leftarrow}$, consider an optimal extending representation giving a. We remove the added neighbors of $\langle u\rangle$ on the left and we shift its endpoint to $\ell(N)$. By the assumptions, all pre-drawn vertices of T are still nested in $\langle u\rangle$, so we do not change maximal chains using them. On the other hand, non-predrawn intervals contained in the leftmost clique can be stretched, so they are not nested in $\langle u\rangle$. So a maximal chain containing them cannot be extended to $\langle u\rangle$. But even before it was not possible that two of these intervals belong to one maximal chain (since we can stretch them suitably), so we shortened maximal chains ending with $\langle u\rangle$ by at most one vertex.

The last inequality that $c^{\leftarrow} \le a$ is done equivalently as in Lemma 4.1. □

Optimization Graphs. The nesting defines a partial ordering $\subsetneq$ on pre-drawn intervals. For every pre-drawn interval $\langle x \rangle'$, we compute $\nu(x)$ in an optimal extending representation of $\mathcal{R}'$ constructed by the algorithm, from bottom to the top on $\subsetneq$ as we encounter pre-drawn intervals inside the sections of the MPQ-tree. Notice that if $\langle u \rangle \subsetneq \langle v \rangle$, then either u is in the sections of the same node as v, or it is below the sections of v. Therefore, all vertices of such a chain ending in $\langle x \rangle'$ consist of intervals already encountered before reaching $\langle x \rangle'$ in the MPQ-tree.

Lemma D.3. *Let T be an interior subtree of the MPQ-tree. The optimal tuple $(a, b^{\leftarrow}, c^{\rightarrow}, b^{\rightarrow}, c^{\leftarrow})$ and the nesting $\nu(u)$ of its exterior pre-drawn intervals is uniquely determined.*

Proof. Let $\langle u \rangle'$ and $\langle v \rangle'$ be pre-drawn intervals defined by G_a, G_b and G_c. Notice that all pre-drawn intervals of T are nested in $\langle u \rangle'$ and $\langle v \rangle'$. Therefore, if optimizing, say $b^{\leftarrow}$, would lead to increasing the nesting of some pre-drawn interval $\nu(x)$, then it would be a contradiction since $\langle x \rangle'$ is nested in $\langle u \rangle'$. □

We compute *optimization subgraph* H for each subtree T. Its *non-auxiliary vertices* are the exterior pre-drawn intervals of T which can be optimized together with *auxiliary vertices* representing $b^{\leftarrow}$, $c^{\rightarrow}$, $b^{\rightarrow}$, $c^{\leftarrow}$, and these numbers for some subtrees. For every vertex, we store its optimal nesting $\nu(x)$ computed by the algorithm. We know that this we either achieve nesting $\nu(x)$ or $\nu(x+1)$, depending how we optimize some subtrees, and it is not possible to decide which situation should be chosen only with the knowledge of T. The issue is that optimizing x might make optimizing y impossible, which we represent by $xy \in E(H)$. Therefore the optimizable subsets of vertices are the independent sets in H.

Output. The algorithm stops at the root node of T, for which it outputs the computed a.

Leaves. For a leaf L, we can easily compute the quadruple $(a, b^{\leftarrow}, c^{\rightarrow}, b^{\rightarrow}, c^{\leftarrow})$ by the definition. Similarly, we can compute $\nu(x)$ for all pre-drawn intervals in $s(L)$. Its optimization graph H contains no vertices.

P-nodes. Let P be a P-node with the children $T_1, \ldots, T_n$ with the computed quadruple $(a_i, b_i^{\leftarrow}, c_i^{\rightarrow}, b_i^{\rightarrow}, c_i^{\leftarrow})$ and the optimization graph H_i for each subtree T_i and $\nu(x)$ computed for every pre-drawn interval of sections of $T_1, \ldots, T_n$. We consider the ordering $\lhd$ on $T_1, \ldots, T_n$. Let $\min(\lhd)$ be the set of its minimal elements and $\max(\lhd)$ of its maximal elements. It follows that $\min(\lhd)$ are candidates for the left-most subtree T_s and $\max(\lhd)$ for the right-most subtree T_t.

There are two types of subtrees. A subtree is called *free* if its sections contain no pre-drawn interval. Otherwise, it is called *restricted*. It is easy to observe that restricted subtrees of P are ordered from left to right, so there is exactly one candidate for $\min(\lhd)$ and exactly one candidate for $\max(\lhd)$. Free subtrees can be placed arbitrarily, so they might be candidates for $\min(\lhd)$ and $\max(\lhd)$, depending whether there are some exterior subtrees. We note that when $\min(\lhd)$

or $\max(\lhd)$ is not uniquely determined, then by Lemma D.2 we know that we can optimize at most one by choosing the right T_s and T_t.

Suppose that $T_s \in \min(\lhd)$ and $T_t \in \max(\lhd)$ is fixed. We first compute as follows $\nu(x)$ for intervals of $s(P)$. Let W be the union of the pre-drawn intervals of sections of T and of $s(P)$. For the pre-drawn intervals $\langle z \rangle'$ of W which belong to sections of $T_1, \ldots, T_n$, we already know their values $\nu(z)$. For the remaining elements of W, we compute $\nu(x)$ from bottom to the top in $\subsetneq$. If $s(P)$ consists of a single non-predrawn interval x, we can assume that no pre-drawn interval y in sections of $T_1, \ldots, T_n$ is nested in it, and x is nested in u of G_a, and non-nested in u and v of G_b and G_c. Assuming that we know $\nu(y)$ for every $y \in \mathrm{Pred}(x)$, we compute $\nu(x)$ as follows:

$$\nu(x) = \max\left\{b_s^{\leftarrow}, b_t^{\rightarrow}, a_i, \nu(y) : i \neq s, t \text{ and } y \in \mathrm{Pred}(x)\right\} + 1.$$

Using these parameters, we compute $(a, b^{\leftarrow}, b^{\rightarrow}, c^{\rightarrow}, c^{\leftarrow})$ for fixed $T_s \in \min(\lhd)$ and $T_t \in \max(\lhd)$ as follows:

$$\begin{aligned}
a &= \max\{a_1, \ldots, a_k, \nu(y) : y \in \mathrm{Pred}(u)\}.\\
b^{\leftarrow} &= \max\{b_s^{\leftarrow}, a_i, \nu(y) : i \neq s \text{ and } y \in \mathrm{Pred}(u)\}.\\
c^{\rightarrow} &= \max\{b_t^{\rightarrow}, a_i, \nu(y) : i \neq t \text{ and } y \in \mathrm{Pred}(v)\}.\\
b^{\rightarrow} &= \max\{b_t^{\rightarrow}, a_i, \nu(y) : i \neq t \text{ and } y \in \mathrm{Pred}(u)\}.\\
c^{\leftarrow} &= \max\{b_s^{\leftarrow}, a_i, \nu(y) : i \neq s \text{ and } y \in \mathrm{Pred}(v)\}.
\end{aligned}$$

Since the values given by $T_1, \ldots, T_n$ are not fully determined, we also use the optimization subgraph $H_1, \ldots, H_n$ to obtain the precise values of the above formulas. We substitute into the formulas maximums for each $\nu(y)$ such that $y \in s(P)$, and we can distribute these maximums to obtain only one maximum. Therefore, in each formula is a maximum over some subset of $a_1, \ldots, a_n$ increased by some constants, and over the variables of vertices of $H_1, \ldots, H_n$ increased by some constants. (These constants depend on lengths of chains in $s(P)$.)

In each formula, we remove all variables except the maximal ones. Then the formula has a value ℓ if all values it depends on are optimized, or $\ell+1$ otherwise. We can check that there no edges in $H_1, \ldots, H_n$ between these variables which need to be optimized to get ℓ, otherwise we directly set the value to $\ell + 1$.

The value a is used when T is placed inside of its parent, or at the end of the algorithm. Therefore, we can greedily optimize a over all possible choices $T_s \in \min(\lhd)$ and $T_t \in \max(\lhd)$ such that $T_s \neq T_t$, ignoring the remaining variables since all pre-drawn intervals will be internal with respect to the rest of the tree.

For each $b^{\leftarrow}$ and $b^{\rightarrow}$, we choose independently $T_s \in \min(\lhd)$ and $T_t \in \max(\lhd)$ such that $T_s \neq T_t$, and we use the choice giving the optimal values a, $b^{\leftarrow}$ and $b^{\rightarrow}$ using the above procedure over all possible choices of T_s and T_t. If $\min(\lhd) \cap \max(\lhd) = \emptyset$, we get that the optimal choice of T_s and T_t in both cases is the same. Otherwise all subtrees $T_1, \ldots, T_n$ are internal and by Lemmas D.2 and D.3, we get the values of all variables differs by at most one in all choices.

We construct the optimization graph H as the disjoin union of $H_1 \cup \cdots \cup H_n$ together with the optimizable variables of exterior pre-drawn intervals of $s(P)$ and with auxiliary vertices representing $b^{\leftarrow}$, $b^{\rightarrow}$, $c^{\leftarrow}$, and $c^{\rightarrow}$. We put an edge $xy \in E(H)$ if x contains in its formula w and y contains z such that $wz \in E(H_i)$.

Lemma D.4. *The described procedure computes $(a, b^{\leftarrow}, c^{\rightarrow}, b^{\rightarrow}, c^{\leftarrow})$ and the optimization subgraph H of a P-node correctly.*

Proof. First, suppose that $T_s \in \min(\lhd)$ and $T_t \in \max(\lhd)$ is given. We argue that the above formulas compute the nestings $\nu(x)$ and the tuple $(a, b^{\leftarrow}, c^{\rightarrow}, b^{\rightarrow}, c^{\leftarrow})$ correctly. For T_i, where $i \neq s, t$, all their intervals are nested inside all intervals of $s(P)$ and inside both $\langle u \rangle'$ and $\langle v \rangle'$ in all G_a, G_b, and G_c; therefore we can use their optimal representation, which increase nesting by exactly a_i. Concerning T_s, all intervals not contained in the leftmost maximal clique are nested in $s(P)$ and both $\langle u \rangle'$ and $\langle v \rangle'$. On the other hand, unlike for recognition, it is not true that intervals contained in the leftmost clique can be stretched far to the left to not be nested in $s(P)$ and $\langle u \rangle'$ and $\langle v \rangle'$ for $b^{\leftarrow}$ and $b^{\rightarrow}$. The reason is that some of them may be pre-drawn, but for those intervals $\langle x \rangle$ we know $\nu(x)$ from H_s. Therefore, we get in the optimal situation the chain prolonged by only $b_s^{\leftarrow}$ instead of a_s.

We compute $\nu(x)$ of intervals of $s(P)$ from the bottom to the top, always using all chains below $\langle x \rangle$ and extending the longest one which is forced, so the formula is correct. Concerning a, we know that all subtrees $T_1, \ldots, T_n$ are nested inside $\langle u \rangle'$ which gives the nesting at least a_i. If $s(P) \neq \emptyset$, we further consider $\nu(y)$ of all intervals of $s(P)$ to compute $\nu(u)$. Concerning $b^{\leftarrow}$, only the intervals not contained in the leftmost clique are forced to be nested in $\langle u \rangle'$, so we use $b_s^{\leftarrow}$ instead of a_s. Similarly the remaining formulas are correct.

For a, we test all possible choices of $T_s \in \min(\lhd)$ and $T_t \in \max(\lhd)$ and choose the smallest a. We argued above that either the choice of T_s and T_t is independent, or the difference of all variables when we optimize with respect to $b^{\leftarrow}$ and $b^{\rightarrow}$ is at most one. So we can represent the output by a graph H. □

Q-node. If $\lhd$ allows flipping of a Q-node Q, we compute the following for both orderings. For each of a, $b^{\leftarrow}$ and $c^{\rightarrow}$, and $b^{\rightarrow}$ and $c^{\leftarrow}$, we use the versions which minimizes their values. So we can assume that the subtrees $T_1, \ldots, T_n$ ordered from left to right, for which we know their quadruples $(a, b^{\leftarrow}, c^{\rightarrow}, b^{\rightarrow}, c^{\leftarrow})$ and for pre-drawn intervals $\langle x \rangle'$ in their sections we know $\nu(x)$.

Consider the intervals of sections of Q. Some of them are pre-drawn and we consider the ordering $\subsetneq$ given by nesting. Unlike for P-nodes, we also consider non-pre-drawn intervals of sections of Q. For two vertices of sections of T, we define nesting ordering $\subsetneq$ as follows: $\langle x \rangle \subsetneq \langle y \rangle$ if the section $s_x^{\leftarrow}(Q)$ is on the left of $s_y^{\leftarrow}(Q)$ and the section $s_x^{\rightarrow}(Q)$ is on the right of $s_y^{\rightarrow}(Q)$. Let W be the set of all pre-drawn intervals of $G[T]$ together with the intervals of sections of Q. We get a partial ordering $\subsetneq$ on W.

For all inner subtrees T_i, we have two possible optimization: we optimize with respect to the left side, which is encoded by $b_i^{\leftarrow}$ and $c_i^{\rightarrow}$, or with respect

to the right side, which is encoded by $c_i^{\leftarrow}$ and $b_i^{\rightarrow}$. In the former case, we put $\bigcirc_i^{\leftarrow} = b_i^{\leftarrow}$ and $\bigcirc_i^{\rightarrow} = c_i^{\rightarrow}$. In the latter case, we put $\bigcirc_i^{\leftarrow} = c_i^{\leftarrow}$ and $\bigcirc_i^{\rightarrow} = b_i^{\rightarrow}$. Suppose that we fix some choices of $\bigcirc_i^{\leftarrow}$ and $\bigcirc_i^{\rightarrow}$. In b_i^*, c_i^* and $\bigcirc_i^*$, the symbol $*$ is a replacement of either $\leftarrow$, or $\rightarrow$.

We process W from the bottom to the top. Suppose that we process some $x \in W$ and we know $\nu(y)$ for every direct predecessor of x. Let $s_s(Q) = s_x^{\leftarrow}(Q)$ and $s_t(Q) = s_x^{\rightarrow}(Q)$. We get the following formula:

$$\nu(x) = \max\{\bigcirc_s^{\leftarrow}, \bigcirc_t^{\rightarrow}, a_i, \nu(y) : s < i < t \text{ and } y \in \mathrm{Pred}(x)\} + 1.$$

Using these parameters, we compute $(a, b^{\leftarrow}, b^{\rightarrow}, c^{\rightarrow}, c^{\leftarrow})$ as follows:

$$\begin{aligned}
a &= \max\{a_1, \ldots, a_n, \nu(y) : y \in \mathrm{Pred}(u)\} \\
b^{\leftarrow} &= \max\{b_1^{\leftarrow}, a_i, \nu(y) : i > 1 \text{ and } y \in \mathrm{Pred}(u)\}. \\
c^{\rightarrow} &= \max\{b_n^{\rightarrow}, a_i, \nu(y) : i < n \text{ and } y \in \mathrm{Pred}(v)\}. \\
b^{\rightarrow} &= \max\{b_n^{\rightarrow}, a_i, \nu(y) : i < n \text{ and } y \in \mathrm{Pred}(u)\}. \\
c^{\leftarrow} &= \max\{b_1^{\leftarrow}, a_i, \nu(y) : i > 1 \text{ and } y \in \mathrm{Pred}(v)\}.
\end{aligned}$$

If Q is flippable, we compute $b^{\leftarrow}$ (resp. $b^{\rightarrow}$) using both orderings and choose the one primarily minimizing $b^{\leftarrow}$ (resp. $b^{\rightarrow}$) and secondarily minimizing $c^{\rightarrow}$ (resp. $c^{\leftarrow}$). If $b^{\leftarrow}$ and $c^{\rightarrow}$ are obtained by a different ordering than $b^{\rightarrow}$ and $c^{\leftarrow}$, then all values differ by at most one, as argued in the last paragraph of the proof of Lemma D.6.

Subtree T_i is called *optimizable* if $b^{\leftarrow} < c^{\leftarrow}$ or equivalently $b^{\rightarrow} < c^{\rightarrow}$, and *unoptimizable* otherwise.

Lemma D.5. *If a subtree T is optimizable, then $b^{\leftarrow} = c^{\leftarrow} - 1$ and $b^{\rightarrow} = c^{\rightarrow} - 1$.*

Proof. We argue just that $b^{\leftarrow} = c^{\leftarrow} - 1$, the other equality is symmetrical. We know that the root of T is either a P-node, or a Q-node.

Case 1: It is a P-node P. We know that all subtrees $T_1, \ldots, T_n$ are interior, so by Lemma D.2 we get that $a_i - 1 \leq b_i^{\leftarrow} \leq c_i^{\leftarrow} \leq a_i$. Therefore, over all choices of $T_s \in \min(\lhd)$ and $T_t \in \max(\lhd)$, we get that $b^{\leftarrow} = c^{\leftarrow} - 1$ (since both $\langle u \rangle$ and $\langle v \rangle$ have nested the same intervals of $s(P)$ nested).

Case 2: It is a Q-node Q. There are two possible ways to optimize Q-node: by flipping and by optimizing its subtrees. First assume that the ordering of $T_1, \ldots, T_n$ is fixed. If T_i is an optimizable subtree, we know that $b_i^{\leftarrow} = c_i^{\leftarrow} - 1$ and $b_i^{\rightarrow} = c_i^{\rightarrow} - 1$. (If the root of T_i is a P-node, we know it by Case 1, otherwise by the induction hypothesis.) Consider an optimal extending representation of $\mathcal{R}'_{c^{\leftarrow}}$ defining $c^{\leftarrow}$, and consider a chain of $c^{\leftarrow}$ intervals nested in $\langle v \rangle'$. This chain starts in some optimizable subtree T_i where it has c_i^* nested intervals. In the optimal representation of $\mathcal{R}'_{b^{\leftarrow}}$, we have to rotate the subtree, so this chain now uses only b_i^* intervals; so it is one interval shorter. Therefore, $b^{\leftarrow} = c^{\leftarrow} - 1$.

If Q is flippable, then every exterior pre-drawn interval has to be contained in $s_1(Q)$ and $s_n(Q)$, all other pre-drawn intervals are interior. The rest can be argued similarly as in the proof of Lemma D.2, by showing that $a - 1 \leq b^{\leftarrow}$ which by $c^{\leftarrow} \leq a$ shows that $b^{\leftarrow} \geq c^{\leftarrow} - 1$. □

We use Lemma D.5 to simplify the Q-node formulas to avoid testing all 2^{n-2} possible choices of $\bigcirc_i^*$. In each formula, we substitute $\nu(y)$ with the corresponding maximum, whose terms can be distributed into the maximum itself. (This can be computed efficiently using the nested structure of the Q-node.) Therefore, we end up with formulas containing only a_i, $\bigcirc_i^{\leftarrow}$, $\bigcirc_i^{\rightarrow}$ and one added constant. If there is a_i and $\bigcirc_i^*$ of the same index, we can remove the $\bigcirc_i^*$ since $\bigcirc_i^* \leq a_i$. Now, for non-optimizable subtree, we can substitute b_i^* for $\bigcirc_i^*$. Similarly, we use $b_1^{\leftarrow}$ for $\bigcirc_1^{\leftarrow}$ and $b_n^{\rightarrow}$ for $\bigcirc_n^{\rightarrow}$. One further simplification is that we can ignore $\nu(x)$ for every x which does not belong to $s_1(Q)$ or $s_n(Q)$, since its nesting is counted in $(a, b^{\leftarrow}, c^{\rightarrow}, b^{\rightarrow}, c^{\leftarrow})$.

Lemma D.6. *Let T be an optimizable subtree of the MPQ-tree. Then optimizing according to $b^{\leftarrow}$ and $c^{\rightarrow}$, or according $b^{\rightarrow}$ and $c^{\leftarrow}$ uniquely determines the values of $\nu(x)$.*

Proof. Let $\langle x \rangle'$ be an exterior interval of T. We want to show that we either optimize $b^{\leftarrow}$, which forces one value of $\nu(x)$, or we optimize $b^{\rightarrow}$, which forces some other value of $\nu(x)$. We know that the root of T is either a P-node, or a Q-node.

Case 1: It is a P-node P. Let $T_1, \ldots, T_n$ be the subtrees of T, we know that all of them are interior. Therefore by Lemma D.3, optimizing T_i according to $b_i^{\leftarrow}$ and $c_i^{\rightarrow}$, or according to $b_i^{\rightarrow}$ and $c_i^{\leftarrow}$ uniquely determines the values of $\nu(x)$. Following the P-node formulas, we also the same for T.

Case 2: It is a Q-node Q. First, we assume again first that Q is non-flippable. We have two types of exterior intervals of Q: some are on the left in $s_1(Q)$ or T_1. The others are on the right in $s_n(Q)$ or T_n. For each subtree T_i, we have the tuple $(a_i, b_i^{\leftarrow}, c_i^{\rightarrow}, b_i^{\rightarrow}, c_i^{\leftarrow})$ and H_i.

If T_i is non-optimizable, we just decide which values we will optimize using H_i. If T_i is optimizable, we know that the choice whether to use $b_i^{\leftarrow}$ or $b_i^{\rightarrow}$ uniquely determines the optimal value of other variables. (If the root of T_i is a P-node, we know it by Case 1, otherwise by the induction hypothesis.) As in the formulas for Q-nodes, we denote the choices by $\bigcirc_i^{\leftarrow}$ and $\bigcirc_i^{\rightarrow}$. We simplify the Q-node formulas as discussed above, and we get some values forced to be optimized with $b^{\leftarrow}$, some with $b^{\rightarrow}$, and the remaining ones can be optimized independently.

It remains to deal with the case that Q is flippable. As argued in Lemma D.5, we get that all exterior intervals of Q are contained in $s_1(Q)$ and $s_n(Q)$. Since all subtrees $T_1, \ldots, T_n$ are interior with respect to Q, we can just optimize $b^{\leftarrow}$ by a suitable flipping of Q and the rest is forced, and similarly for $b^{\rightarrow}$. □

Concerning a, we can greedily minimize all $\bigcirc_i^*$ its expression. For the remaining expressions, we know by Lemma D.6 that each $\nu(x)$ has one of two possible values, we construct the optimization graph H as the disjoint union of $H_1, \ldots, H_n$ together with the vertices corresponding to exterior intervals of sections of Q and auxiliary vertices $b^{\leftarrow}$, $b^{\rightarrow}$, $c^{\leftarrow}$, $c^{\rightarrow}$. We put an edge between x and y if and only if, say, the expression for $\nu(x)$ contains $\bigcirc_i^{\leftarrow}$ and the expression for $\nu(y)$ contains $\bigcirc_i^{\rightarrow}$.

Lemma D.7. *The described procedure computes* $(a, b^{\leftarrow}, c^{\rightarrow}, b^{\rightarrow}, c^{\leftarrow})$ *and the optimization subgraph* H *of a Q-node correctly.*

Proof. We optimize possibly over both orderings $T_1, \ldots, T_n$ and $T_n, \ldots, T_1$, and over all possible rotations of optimizable subtrees. For $(a, b^{\leftarrow}, c^{\rightarrow}, b^{\rightarrow}, c^{\leftarrow})$ and $\nu(x)$ of intervals x of sections Q, we give correct formulas to determine their optimal nesting, depending on choices of values for subtrees. By Lemmas D.5 and D.6, we know that all values can be optimized only by one, so it can be encoded by the computed optimization graph H. □

Putting Together. Now, we are ready to prove that RepExt(k-NestedINT) can be solved in polynomial time:

Proof (Theorem 1.3). We follow the described steps and compute the optimal nesting of an extending representation using the MPQ-tree from the bottom to the top. We clearly initiate with the correct tuples and graphs H for leaves. If we encounter a P-node, we apply the P-node procedure which is correct by Lemma D.4. Similarly in a Q-node, we apply the Q-node procedure which is correct by D.7. Therefore the algorithm correctly outputs. Clearly, it can be implemented in polynomial time. □